



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/079,192

02/19/2002

Gary Handwerker

6081-005

7298

7590 08/09/2007
ROSENBAUM & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
650 DUNDEE ROAD
SUITE 380
NORTHBROOK, IL 60062

EXAMINER

LONEY, DONALD J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1772

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/09/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/079,192

Applicant(s)

HANDWERKER, GARY

Examiner

Donald Loney

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 28-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 28-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 28-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification fails to provide support for the first and second flexible films being "undulating" per claims 28, 30, 34 and 37. The specification at page 9, lines describes a film with insulative pockets 18, but does not disclose the film as being undulating. Figures 2-4 may be somewhat undulating, however, this is a cross sectional view therefore the film is not actually undulating. It is a film as shown in figure 1, wherein pockets 18 are formed over the entire surface in order to form a bubble type film when laminated to another flat layer. In addition, undulating could be referring to a corrugated film which the applicant does not have support for. The specification fails to provide support for the "heat reflective elements dispersed throughout" a film per claims 28, 29, 31, 34, 35 and 37. The specification, at page 10, lines 8-11 disclose a "heat reflective material" in the films, however, that is different than "elements". The term "elements" could encompass other things (i.e. mirrors) not supported by the specification. The specification fails to provide support for the "second

Art Unit: 1772

moisture impervious film having an additional reflective coating thereon per claim 29.

From page 10, lines 8-11 the film can have either a reflective material dispersed therein or a coating thereon, but not both. Claim 28 already has the "elements" dispersed therein, therefore, they cannot be coated too as per claim 29. It would have to be one or the other. The specification fails to provide support for the "nonstick" recitation in claim 33. On page 15, lines 12-15 of the specification the surface is disclosed as smooth and remains some what slippery when wet, but not that it is a nonstick surface.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 28-31 and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any of Hines et al (3577305), Edgel (4579756) or Hunter (5792539) in view of the Applicant's discussion of the prior art (ADPA) or Kern (4544600).

All of the primary references teach a first and second moisture-impervious films with a first and second undulating film applied thereto per claims 28 and 34. This forms a structure of two bubble type laminates facing one another as shown in applicant's figure 1 and 2. See figures 1-3 in Hines showing outer layers 22, 26 and the spaced insulative intermediate layers 30 which have cells 32 formed therefrom sealed around the edge 36' thereof. The outer layers are disclosed as a metal coated plastic film (column 3, lines 32-40). Refer to figures 2 and 11 in Edgel showing outer layers 11, 12 and the spaced insulative intermediate layers 13 and the edge seal around each section 10 formed from the blanket. The outer layers are disclosed as a metal coated plastic film (column 4, lines 1-12). Refer to figures 1-5 and 12 in Hunter showing outer layers 20, 30, 24, 34 and the spaced insulative intermediate layers 12, 14 and the edge seal 42 around the edge of the blanket. The outer layers are disclosed as a metal coated plastic film (column 10 line 38 through column 11, line 36). The difference between the claimed invention of independent claims 28 and 34 is that the prior art fails to teach the outer bottom layer as having heat reflective "elements" dispersed throughout the polymer, they teach foil coated plastics. At least Hines discloses that the reflective layer can be a metalized plastic film, a metal foil or other reflective layers (see column 3, lines 35-40).

However, from the ADPA on page 10, lines 12-18 and the applicant's comments filed September 20, 2006 (page 9, third full paragraph) it is known that reflective layers can be formed or either metal coated plastics or plastics with metal dispersed therein. Kern also discloses it is known to include a metal particles in a plastic film in order to provided reflectivity thereto. See column 1, lines 9-15 and column 2, lines 18-21.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to the primary references to substitute one reflective layer for another (i.e. plastic with dispersed material versus coated plastic) as the outer layer, as taught to be known by the ADPA and Kern, motivated by the fact the primary references teach the outer layer to be reflective. With regards to claims 30, 31 and 35 it would be obvious to include reflective "elements" in these other layers for the same reasons it is included in the original outer film of claims 28 and 34. With regards to claim 33, the recitation to smooth is a mere relative term which does not distinguish from the prior art. With regards to claim 38 which includes an additional bubble layer it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include another layer for the same purpose the first two bubble layers where used which would increase the insulating effect of the blanket.

6. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any of Hines et al (3577305), Edgel (4579756) or Hunter (5792539) in view of the Applicant's discussion of the prior art (ADPA) or Kern as applied to claims 28-31 and 33-37 above, and further in view of Sheridan (5011743).

The combination of the primary references disclose he invention substantially as recited except for the top layer being dark in color. See 35 USC 103 rejection above.

Sheridan et al teaches that one can apply a black coating to desired sections of an enveloped heat insulating pad containing spaced interior elements in order to improve heat radiating characteristics of the pad. Refer to the Abstract and column 3, lines 17-44.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to the primary references to provide a black layer thereon, as taught by Sheridan, in order to improve the heat radiating means thereof motivated by the fact that this layer would function the same as the applicants' dark layer.

7. Claims 28-31 and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any of Brockhaus (4535828), Handwerker (5549956) or WO 98/10216 to Aanestad in view of the applicant's discussion of the prior art ADPA or Kern.

All of the primary references teach a first and second moisture-impervious films with a first and second undulating film applied thereto per claims 28 and 34. This forms a structure of two bubble type laminates facing one another as shown in applicant's figure 1 and 2. Brockhaus teaches two bubble layers 43 contained between two outer layers 45. Figure 1 shows complete encapsulation of the bubble layers. A foil layer may be applied between the bubble layers and/or be applied to the skin layers. This would then read upon the embodiments of both the outer layers and/or the insulative bubble layer(s) having a reflective layer thereon. Refer to figures 1 and 2C along with column 2, lines 12-60, column 4, lines 44-47 and column 5 lines 23-48. WO 98/10216 to Aanestad teaches insulation that contains two outer layers (16 or 20 and 18 or 22), two bubble insulating layers (10, 12) there between with reflective layers (16, 18) on what can be considered either the bubble layers or outer layer when not looking at layers 16 and 18 as outer layers. Refer to the Figure, Abstract and page 11, line 32 through page 14, line 2 along with the claims. The reference contains layers that would read upon the two

bubble type layers facing one another per claims 28 and 34. Handwerker teaches an insulation blanket with two inner bubble layers (16, 30) enveloped by two outer layers (12, 14) wherein a reflective layer(s) (18,32) is/are located between (i.e., on both the outer and bubble layer) the bubble layers and outer layers which is sealed at the edge thereof. Refer to Fig. Nos. 4-6 along with the corresponding text to the numbers referred to above. Handwerker layers 12,18,16,34,30,32 and 14 are equivalent to Aanestad layers 20,16,10,14,12,18 and 22 respectively as discussed above, except for layer 34 being a foil in Handwerker and a plastic film in Aanestad. Therefore, the layers apply to the claims as explained above just using the reference numbers in Handwerker that equate to Aanestad. The difference between the claimed invention of independent claims 28 and 34 is that the prior art fails to teach the outer bottom layer as having heat reflective "elements" dispersed throughout the polymer, they teach foil coated plastics. At least Handwerker discloses that the reflective layer can be aluminum foil or like metallic reflective materials (see column 3, lines 333-36).

However, from the ADPA on page 10, lines 12-18 and the applicant's comments filed September 20, 2006 (page 9, third full paragraph) it is known that reflective layers can be formed or either metal coated plastics or plastics with metal dispersed therein. Kern also discloses it is known to include a metal particles in a plastic film in order to provided reflectivity thereto. See column 1, lines 9-15 and column 2, lines 18-21.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to the primary references to substitute one reflective layer for another (i.e. plastic with dispersed material versus coated plastic) as the outer layer,

as taught to be known by the ADPA or Kern, motivated by the fact the primary references teach the outer layer to be reflective. With regards to claims 2, 4 and 7 that the layers are fixed to one another, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to fix components together in order to keep the from moving relative to one another. With regards to claims 30, 31 and 35 it would be obvious to include reflective "elements" in these other layers for the same reasons it is included in the original outer film of claims 28 and 34. With regards to claim 33, the recitation to smooth is a mere relative term which does not distinguish from the prior art. With regards to claim 38 which includes an additional bubble layer it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include another layer for the same purpose the first two bubble layers were used which would increase the insulating effect of the blanket. With regards to the unsplit limitations of claim 34 with respect to Brockhaus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to omit an element or its intended function as a matter of obvious design choice. See *In re Karlson*, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA 1963).

8. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any of Brockhaus (4535828), Handwerker (5549956) or WO 98/10216 to Aanestad in view of the applicant's discussion of the prior art ADPA or Kern as applied to claims 28-31 and 33-37 above, and further in view of Sheridan (5011743).

The combination of the primary references disclose the invention substantially as recited except for the top layer being dark in color. See 35 USC 103 rejection above.

Sheridan et al teaches that one can apply a black coating to desired sections of an enveloped heat insulating pad containing spaced interior elements in order to

improve heat radiating characteristics of the pad. Refer to the Abstract and column 3, lines 17-44.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to the primary references to provide a black layer thereon, as taught by Sheridan, in order to improve the heat radiating means thereof motivated by the fact that this layer would function the same as the applicants' dark layer.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 28-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. With regards to the applicant arguing that the examiner inappropriately used the applicant's response filed September 20, 2006 to render the claims obvious, the examiner also referred to page 10 of the specification wherein the applicant referred to the reflective material as being available. The examiner also cited Kern which discloses that reflective films are known to be formed of polymers with metal particles dispersed therein. The applicant also argues that the functional limitations of the dark layer per claim 32 would not be obvious over Sheridan. However, the combination of the references teaches the final structure recited in the claims and therefor this limitation does not distinguish from the prior art.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald Loney whose telephone number is (571) 272-1493. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon, Tues, Thurs and Fri. 8AM-4PM, flex schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1772

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Donald J. Loney/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1772

DJL;D.Loney
08/03/07